

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination and appropriate fee in reply to the Office Action dated July 22, 2008. Claims 73-100 currently stand rejected. Applicant has amended claims 73-75, 78-80, 83, 84, 87, 88, 91-93 and 96-98 for clarification. Claims 89 and 90 were amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

In light of the amendment and the remarks presented below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all now-pending claims of the present application.

Claim Objections

Claims 89 and 90 have drawn objection for reciting methods, but being dependent from a system claim. Applicant has amended claims 89 and 90 to correct this deficiency by indicating that claims 89 and 90 are system claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §101

Claims 78-82, 87, 88 and 96-100 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As discussed in the telephone conference with the Examiner on September 2, 2008, Applicant has amended independent claims 78, 87 and 96 to recite that the system configuration is accomplished via execution of instructions stored on a computer readable medium.

Applicant respectfully notes that the specification describes that embodiments of the present invention may be practiced with software running in a computer or server based processor at page 14, lines 16-25. Applicant respectfully submits that a computer or server executing software provides clear support for the recitation of instructions stored in a computer readable medium. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 78, 87 and 96 (and by dependency claims 79-82, 88 and 97-100) are statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 73-100 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Banerjee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,983,273, hereinafter "Banerjee").

As discussed in the teleconference of September 3, 2008, the claimed invention provides for providing information about the degree of similarity between parties in response to user input which identifies one of the parties or a representative website of one of the parties, without requiring a user to enter a keyword search or provide other advance knowledge of a subject of the information groups. During the teleconference, the Examiner noted that the prior art consistently requires a keyword search for such operations. However, the claimed invention provides for the provision of information about the degree of similarity between parties or groups without requiring any keyword search entry or other advance knowledge of a subject of the information groups. Applicants have amended the independent claims in an effort to clarify this distinction.

Thus, the claimed invention enables deriving a content profile for an information group (claims 73 and 79) or defining a list of related words (claims 83 and 87) without prior knowledge of the content of the information group. Independent claims 91 and 96 also describe the derivation of a content profile for an information group without prior knowledge of the subject of the information group. In other words, embodiments of the claimed invention do not require the user to provide any profile information descriptive of the content to be categorized. Banerjee fails to teach or suggest such a method "without requiring a user to enter a keyword search or provide other advance knowledge of a subject of the information group" as provided for the claimed invention.

The Office Action cites FIGS. 7 and 8 of Banerjee as disclosing the above recited feature. However, this is based on the Examiner's prior understanding that even the claimed invention required some form of query or keyword input. However, the claimed invention does not require such input. Having established this common understanding, it can be noted that neither FIG. 7 nor FIG. 8 discloses the stimuli causing the information provided to be displayed on the screen. Hence, neither figure specifically discloses a method "without requiring a user to enter a keyword search or provide other advance knowledge of a subject of the information group" as

provided in the claimed invention. In addition, other content in Banerjee makes it clear that the stimuli used to provide the displayed results in FIGS. 7 and 8 include a conventional set of search terms in a search query, as input to a conventional search engine page. Such a search query may be referred to as a “keyword search”, which the claimed invention replaces by using an automatically generated profile of an existing website as an integral part of the method, rather than requiring the user to provide a keyword search or other advance knowledge.

Notably, the claimed invention replaces the conventional search engine with alternative embodiments that are specifically designed to find similar parties (e.g., as provided at least for claim 73), and which does not require input of a conventional search engine query. Thus, the claimed invention provides a benefit to the user in that the user does not need to know anything about a party, such as keywords which are representative of the party, in order to find similar information. Instead, the claimed invention requires one party’s website address (or other identification of the party) as the only input stimuli in order to return a set of similar websites, which is not disclosed in Banerjee. Instead, Banerjee discloses a conventional search engine index. Meanwhile, the claimed invention replaces the conventional search engine index and eliminates any requirement for a search query by replacing the requirement for search term input with an automatically generated profile built automatically from an existing website.

Banerjee describes an addition to an existing search engine, which requires a search term query as described at col. 8, lines 32-36. The cited passage provides that the “accumulated and/or adjusted characteristic factors are then stored in or associated with (46) the rest of the “normal” search engine index (34) in a ratings index (34’), which can be subsequently managed similarly to other system resources in the search engine server”. Note the separation of the ratings index from the conventional search engine. Banerjee also describes, in reference to FIG. 5, element 51, which clearly annotates that the system receives search criteria from a Client (32), rather than automatically generating search criteria (e.g., the profiles automatically generated), as provided in the claimed invention. Col. 7, lines 18-23 of Banerjee also states that the “enhanced search engine server comprises the software functionality of a standard search engine server, preferably including the ability to perform searches of its indexed (34) linked sites (36) by keyword, phrases, hierarchical categorization and query by example”. Col. 8, lines 39-42 and

col. 10, line 41 are further examples of the requirement for manual input of a search query in Banjeree.

Banerjee does disclose that the search engine's indexing operation may be completely automatic (see col. 1, lines 52-54). However, the indexing referred to in this section involves the generation of a single index by indexing all content on a particular page except certain predefined words. Thus, the "automatic" indexing of Banerjee does not automatically compare content profiles to identify a degree of similarity therebetween as provided in the claimed invention or enable providing information about the degree of similarity between parties in response to user input which identifies one of the parties or a representative website of one of the parties, without requiring a user to enter a keyword search or provide other advance knowledge of a subject of the information groups as provided in independent claim 73. To the contrary, the provision of such information by Banerjee requires, in the conventional manner, the further provision of a keyword search query.

Further, with regard to the Office Action's assertion that Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of deriving a content profile for the information group of each party without prior knowledge of the content of the information group, and comparing the profiles to identify a degree of similarity between parties in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8, in which relevance is determined based on counting the number of keywords common to each hit list, Applicant respectfully notes that the relevance percentage in Banerjee is relative to the keyword search (which is advance knowledge of a subject of the information group) provided manually as stimuli to display the similar websites as illustrated in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8, and as described earlier. Col. 9, lines 29-32, which states "*As per typical search engine results*, these results are sorted by degree of relevance" (emphasis added), confirms this conclusion. Thus, it is clear that such a typical search engine result page is sorted relative to the terms of a conventional search query, rather than a relative to a profile of an existing website as provided in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for all the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that Banerjee fails to teach or suggest providing information about the degree of similarity between parties in response to user input which identifies one of the parties or a representative website of one of the parties, without requiring a user to enter a keyword search or provide other advance

knowledge of a subject of the information groups as provided in independent claim 73.

Independent claims 78, 83, 87, 91 and 96 include similar subject matter to that of independent claim 73 with regard to not requiring user entry of a keyword search or other advance knowledge of a subject of the information groups. Thus, independent claims 78, 83, 87, 91 and 96 are patentable over Banerjee for the same corresponding reasons given for independent claim 73. Claims 74-77, 79-82, 84-86, 88-90, 92-95 and 97-100 each depend directly or indirectly from a respective one of independent claims 73, 78, 83, 87, 91 and 96 and therefore include all the recitations of their respective independent claims. Thus, dependent claims 74-77, 79-82, 84-86, 88-90, 92-95 and 97-100 are patentable for at least the same reasons given above for independent claims 73, 78, 83, 87, 91 and 96.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 73-100 are patentable.

Appl. No.: 10/554,031
Amdt. Dated September 22, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 22, 2008

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. As such, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. In order to expedite the examination of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in order to resolve any remaining issues.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Chad L. Thorson
Registration No. 55,675

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON September 22, 2008.**

LEGAL02/52028412v1